

Date: Tue, 11 May 93 04:30:34 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #137
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 11 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 137

Today's Topics:

 Can novices and technicians use RTTY on 10M?
 Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em Whil
 no-code defense (2 msgs)
 Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m (2 msgs)
 The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 10 May 1993 20:28:59 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Can novices and technicians use RTTY on 10M?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The answer is yes. My previous comments were a misread of Part 97.

> Here are two examples of how these can be misinterpreted: Since I hold
> an Extra Class, which is an unrestricted license, can I use 'phone on
> 28.170 MHz (10 meters)? No, since the authorized band plan states that
> only digital modes (CW, RTTY, etc.) can be used in that portion.

Band plan is not the correct term here. The problem is that while you
are authorized to operate on 28.170, the authorized modes are RTTY and DATA
by 97.305(c) and CW by 97.305(a).

> so if that is so, can a Technician Plus use RTTY on that frequency?

> Again, no. Although the band plan authorizes this mode, his operator
> privileges do not (although if he had a General or higher, he could).

First, 97.301(e) gives Novices/Technicians use of 10m from 28.1-28.5 subject to no sharing requirements. Hence he is allowed to operate there.

Then 97.305(c) lists the authorized emissions to 28.0-28.3 to RTTY and DATA, subject only to 97.307(f)(4) which restricts the use to 1200 baud and 1000Hz fsk shift.

There is no restriction on mode (Emission type) in the operator permissions. Novices can't operate RTTY on 80, 40, and 15, as you will find that on these bands 97.305(c) references 97.307(f) (9) which states the Novice and Technician can only use CW. This restriction doesn't appear on the ten meter entries in 97.305(c). If it is meant to apply there, then someone needs to rewrite the regs, because that's now how they read now.

Note that novices can't use image on 28.3-28.5 as 97.307(f)(10) limits them to R3E, J3E, and CW there.

> If you STILL feel I'm wrong, Todd, I invite you to write a letter to
> Mr. Ralph A. Haller, who is the Chief of the Private Radio Bureau of
> the FCC, Washington, DC 20554, and verify these facts, as I have
> presented them to you.

Do you have a copy of Part 97? Why don't you read it.

Date: 10 May 93 16:19:26 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!uchinews!raistlin!timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!
dadams@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Cellular capable scanners...Buy'em Whil
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article 1slp96INNduh@topaz.bds.com, ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

| > As Tsutomu Shimomura demonstrated to the House Subcommittee on
| > Telecommunications and Finance the other week, the very best cellular
| > "scanner" is an actual cell phone with hacked firmware. He says the
| > hardest part is finding the right screwdriver to take off the screws.

|
| Oh great, now we're going to have to have a law banning the manufacture
| of these screw drivers.

|
|-Ron

There probably already is a law. It is called a patent.

(Or do the cell phones use regular old phillips screws? I think the idea behind the quip about the screwdriver was not that they were special, but that the modification was real easy.)

More seriously, I think the congress would act to make it a federal offense to modify or tamper with a cellular tellephone.

Then of course, the republicans will get caught tampering with the democrats cellular phones, and we will have "cell-gate." ;^)

--- (No offense to humor impared republicans like myself. ;^)

--David C. Adams Statistician Cray Research Inc. dadams@cray.com

Old cowboys never die. They just smell that way!

Date: Tue, 11 May 1993 00:12:49 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert) writes:

>Here are two examples of how these can be misinterpreted: Since I hold
>an Extra Class, which is an unrestricted license, can I use 'phone on
>28.170 MHz (10 meters)? No, since the authorized band plan states that
>only digital modes (CW, RTTY, etc.) can be used in that portion. Okay,
>so if that is so, can a Technician Plus use RTTY on that frequency?
>Again, no. Although the band plan authorizes this mode, his operator
>privileges do not (although if he had a General or higher, he could).

Ah, further proof that class of license has little to do with knowledge of the hobby. As the ARRL has concluded in their many publications and presentations of the band plans and as Dan Todd (name has a nice ring to it) pointed out:

>Look up part 97 Subpart D
>97.301:
>(e) "For a station having a control operator holding a Technicianor Novice
>Class operator license:" It specifies privs. on 28.1-28.5 and shows no
>other limitations.
>97.305:
>(c) 10m 28.0-28.3 RTTY, data see 97.304(f)(4)
>97.304(f)(4) defines tech. specs. for allowed RTTY and data transmissions

>and says nothing about license class required.
>97.313(c)(2) Says novice and techs are limited to 200 W PEP on 10 meters,
>nothing about allowed transmission types.

But more importantly, you've managed to confuse two different threads.
The issue of RTTY and data transmission by novices and tech-plus class
licenses is under a different thread. This thread was about the maligning
of no-codes and proposing the simplification of our current licensing
structure (also two issues that have somehow been intermingled.) Or does
the subject "Re: no-code defense" somehow conjure up other issues to you?

As you so aptly pointed out, what other administration has 6 different
classes of amateur licenses? Even the "most advanced" U.S. amateur
licensees apparently can't understand the the current regulations and their
impact on the 6 different classes of licenses based upon your post. Two or
three classes of licenses should be more than enough.

So what would you like me to ask Mr. Haller? Maybe I should ask him to
beef up the written testing portion of the Extra exam on rules and
regulations?

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 16:33:17 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: no-code defense
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

> Also, to stand by and accept the condescending drivel from the sbs gang is
> to agree with it. I certainly hope there are many who find the comments
> emanating from the sbs nodes obnoxious and uncharacteristic of the amateur
> radio community. Certainly in Chicago I have yet to hear one remark even
> closely resembling the invectives spewing forth from *.sbs.com. Like I
> said, glad I'm in Chicago and not Providence.

And we're glad you're there and not in Providence too!

Tony

Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae "Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants

!!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!*
system@garlic.sbs.com

with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to
redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a
source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement
when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

Date: 10 May 1993 20:09:12 GMT
From: topaz.bds.com!topaz.bds.com!ron@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

You're right, I just looked again, Standard (10) only applies between 28.3
and 28.5. Novices and techs are only constrained by the 200 watt limit
on 28.1-28.3.

I apologize.

-Ron

Date: 10 May 93 22:36:14 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Novice/Tech Data privileges on 10m
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

So far the replies are against, but I beleive they are wrong. I seemed
to be aligned with the ARRL too :-)

Reading more of Radio Fungus on Saturday in their "Computers and Ham
radio" column there is an article about getting active using RTTY,
Amtor, Packet and so on on 10m for Novices/Techs. Seems like the
magazine is inconsistent or at least demonstrates the problems you can
have reading part 97.

The reason for the 97.307(f)(10) limitation is to stop these "menials"
using image transmissions (i.e. SSTV) in that sub-band, where it is
allowed to higher class operators. It also prevents novices and techs
from building their own DSB or AM equipment :-(

Note that the two sub-bands (RTTY, data and phone, image) are specified
seperately. There is no limitation applied to 28.1 to 28.3. If this
was the case then there would be a reference to 97.307(f)(10) in the
table containing the RTTY/data subband.

Anyone from the ARRL care to comment?

Kevin Purcell N7WIM / G8UDP
a-kevinp@microsoft.com
"We conjure the spirits of the computer with our spells"

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 22:12:20 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!gatech!asuvax!
chnews!ornews.intel.com!ichips!joshua!jbromley@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The Canonical list of Code-Wars Answers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn) publishes the Canonical list
of Code-Wars Answers. This singular advance in information
compression yields an order-of-magnitude decrease in signal-flame
ratio on Usenet, to wit:

19 12 10 but 14 20 50

53

38 48 52 15 39 and 32

28 so 34 41

43 45 and 24

30

33

55

25

56

- Not an Intel Spokesman

Date: 11 May 93 03:20:54 GMT
From: gsm001!gsm001.mendelson.com!gsmlrn@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What we all agree on - THEORY TESTS THAT MEAN SOMETHING
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May10.135129.5341@porthos.cc.bellcore.com>
whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>I would not be opposed to retaining 20wpm CW requirement for the
>extra class CW segments. A simple solution for those that wish to
>retain the incentive licensing structure would be to combine the
>theory tests for advanced and extra and passage of that would
>entitle the "advanced" licensee all of the voice spectrum not
>available to general or below. Likewise have an "extra" licensee
>which ONLY has a 20wpm CW requirement (no theory) and passing the 20
>wpm test would gain the licensee access to all the CW spectrum not
>available to the general licensee. Just a thought.

Why bother to have code tests at all? Since hams are self policing, I propose "speed limits" on bands. If you aren't sending fast enough no-one would talk to you. Except for "You lid, get back to the XX wpm band."

Any licensed ham would have cw privledges on all bands as long as they stayed within the following limits:

For example:

Current code bands	New code band:
Novice	13 WPM MAXIMUM (no minimum at all), 200 watts.
General	10 WPM minimum
Advanced	20 WPM minimum
Extra	30 WPM minimum

As for phone, rtty, etc,

Novice	Free upgrade to tech, no new novice licenses.
Tech	10 meter ssb (28.3-28.5?), all over 50mHz.
General	same as current.
Advanced	same as current.
Extra	same as current.

This would save a lot of time and money testing people, while giving hams incentive to both use cw and to use it at higher speeds.

Personally I would like to see band segments (preferably from the 10wpm bands) set aside for QRP.

Geoff.

--

Geoffrey S. Mendelson N3OWJ

(215) 242-8712
gsm@mendelson.com or uunet!gsm001!gsm

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 16:31:47 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!news@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May8.224811.15224@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<Zuu03B1w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1skf6b\$d3o@network.ucsd.edu>r.net
Subject : Re: no-code defense

brian@ucsd.edu (Brian Kantor) writes:

> I begin to suspect that this 'ASP' person is really just posting flame
> bait and doesn't believe what he's saying - just trying to get a rise
> out of people who wouldn't talk to him for any other reason.
>
> Next we'll hear the old USENET refrain: excuse number 43: "I was just
> trying an experiment to see what people would say"
>
> Blecch.
> - Brian

No you won't. I'll stand behind every bit of it. And it's not just flame
bait.

Tony

Tony Pelliccio kd1nr/ae "Usenet is like a herd of performing elephants
!!*!*!*!*!*!*!*!* with diarrhea -- massive, difficult to
system@garlic.sbs.com redirect, awe-inspiring, entertaining, and a
----- source of mind-boggling amounts of excrement
when you least expect it." --spaf (1992)

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 19:19:41 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!markz@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993May7.174540.14265@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993May9.130848.4228@ke4zv.uucp>, <C6sM4B.5po@news.Hawaii.Edu>net
Subject : Re: More on no-code

In article <C6sM4B.5po@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>traffic is STILL passed using CW: weather broadcasts, distress traffic,
>navigation warnings, periodic position reports, all go CW; every 6 hours,
>every ship in the world sends it observed weather to a shore station
>via CW.

Except those that use SITOR or send a telex through their Inmarsat terminals. Tune up 20 or 30 KHz and set your tnc to monitor the TOR channels.

My favorite example of how they use CW in the maritime service was monitoring one of the San Francisco area commercial TOR stations. The shipboard channel had been grabbed by a station that hadn't listened first and preempted a transmission in progress. The shore operator really chewed out the shipboard operator, and then to punish them, made them send their traffic in CW.

Mark Zenier markz@ssc.wa.com markz@ssc.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #137
